

# **Mixed Methods Evaluation of the ‘Caring for Providers to Improve Patient Experience’ intervention.**

Patience A. Afulani, MBChB, MPH, PhD<sup>1,2\*</sup>; Monica Getahun, MPH<sup>2</sup>; Jaffer Okiring, MS<sup>3</sup>; Beryl A. Ogolla, BA<sup>4</sup>; Edwina N. Oboke BA<sup>4</sup>; Joyceline Kinyua MPH<sup>5</sup>; Iscar Oluoch<sup>6</sup>; Osamuedeme Odiase, MS<sup>2</sup>; Dan Ochiel MBChB, MMed (Surgery);<sup>7</sup> Wendy Berry Mendes PhD<sup>8</sup>; Linnet Onger MBChB, MMed (Psychiatry)<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Epidemiology and Biostatistics Department, University of California, San Francisco, USA

<sup>2</sup>Institute for Global Health Sciences, University of California, San Francisco, USA

<sup>3</sup>Infectious Diseases Research Collaboration, Kampala, Uganda

<sup>4</sup>Global Programs for Research and Training, Kenya

<sup>5</sup>Kenya Medical Research Institute, Kenya

<sup>6</sup>County Executive Committee, Migori, Kenya

<sup>7</sup>County Health Directorate, Migori, Kenya

<sup>8</sup>Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Francisco, USA

\*Corresponding author

University of California, San Francisco

550 16th St, 3rd Floor

San Francisco, CA 94158

Phone: 415-502-5803

Email: [Patience.Afulani@ucsf.edu](mailto:Patience.Afulani@ucsf.edu)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6739-234X>

**Keywords:** Person-centered maternity care; stress, burnout, bias, providers, experience, quality of care, Kenya

## Abstract

**Objective:** To assess the impact of the “Caring for Providers to Improve Patient Experience (CPIPE)” intervention, which sought to improve person-centered maternal care (PCMC) by addressing two key drivers—provider stress and bias.

**Methods:** CPIPE was successfully piloted over 6-months in two health facilities in Migori County, Kenya in 2022. The evaluation employed a mixed-methods pretest-posttest-non-equivalent-control-group design. Data are from surveys with 80 providers (40 intervention; 40 control) at baseline and endline, and in-depth-interviews with 20 intervention providers. We conducted bivariate, multivariate, and difference-in-difference analysis of quantitative data and thematic analysis of qualitative data.

**Results:** In the intervention group, average knowledge scores increased from 7.8(SD=2.4) at baseline to 9.5(SD=1.8) at endline for stress( $p=0.001$ ), and from 8.9(SD=1.9) to 10.7(SD=1.7) for bias( $p=0.001$ ); perceived stress scores decreased from 20.9(SD=3.9) to 18.6(SD=5.3)( $p=0.019$ ), and burnout from 3.6(SD=1.0) to 3.0(SD=1.0)( $p=0.001$ ); with no significant change in the control group. Qualitative data indicated CPIPE had impact at multiple levels. At the individual level, it improved provider knowledge, skills, self-efficacy, attitudes, behaviors, and experiences. At the interpersonal level, it improved provider-provider and patient-provider relationships leading to a supportive work environment and improved PCMC. At the institutional level, it created a system of accountability for providing PCMC and nondiscriminatory care; and collective action and advocacy to address sources of stress.

**Conclusion:** CPIPE impacted multiple outcomes in the theory of change leading to improvements in both provider and patient experience, including for the most vulnerable patients. These findings will contribute to global efforts to prevent burnout and promote PCMC and equity.

**Clinical trial registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT05019131

<https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT05019131?term=Afulani&checkSpell=false&rank=1>

## Introduction

Person-centered maternal care (PCMC), which refers to responsive, respectful, and compassionate care, is an important dimension of quality of care and indicator of a human rights approach to care [1–4]. Yet, research continue to document poor PCMC across settings—manifesting as poor communication and lack of autonomy, and neglectful, disrespectful, and abusive treatment of women during facility-based childbirth [5–7]. This research also highlights inequities in PCMC with the most vulnerable groups having the worst experiences [6–10]. Two key drivers of poor PCMC and inequities in PCMC are provider burnout and bias [11–17].

Burnout, which is a state of physical, mental, and emotional exhaustion, is an important predictor of both poor patient and provider experience [18,19]. A key symptom of burnout, depersonalization, manifests as negativism, cynicism, and poor attitudes towards patients, leading to poor patient experiences [18,19]. Further, burnout is characterized by decreased professional efficacy, resulting in poor job satisfaction [20,21]. Burnout is caused by prolonged stress from exposure to stressors—environmental factors over which people have no control [22]. For maternal healthcare workers in low resource settings, these stressors are numerous: high workload, lack of basic resources, unsupportive work environments, limited competency to manage obstetric and newborn emergencies, and repeated trauma from avoidable morbidity mortality among others [23–25]. Provider burnout while previously high, has risen to crises levels since the COVID-19 pandemic [26,27], with particularly high rates among providers in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) [28–30]. In Kenya, over 80% of maternal health providers had moderate to high perceived stress and low to high burnout levels [31,32]. Further studies among maternal health providers in Kenya highlight provider stress and burnout as a key driver of poor PCMC [11,13,14,16].

Bias—perceiving and treating people differently according to their social group—on the other hand, leads to differential patient experiences [33,34]. Bias can be implicit (unconscious or unintentional) or explicit (conscious or intentional), and manifests as differing care based on patients’ attributes such as socio-

economic status (SES), racial identity, ethnicity, and age. For example, lower SES patients often have more negative healthcare experiences than higher SES patients due to providers perceiving them to be less intelligent, compliant, and uninterested in promoting their health [35–37]. Providers also spend less time with low SES patients and provide insufficient information, contributing to distrust, poor adherence to treatment recommendations, and health disparities over time [38–40]. Studies in SSA, including Kenya have highlighted the role of provider bias in PCMC, demonstrating that healthcare workers provide differential care based on women’s appearances, perceptions of women’s ability to understand and be cooperative, and women’s ability to advocate for themselves and hold providers accountable [13–15,17].

Patient experience is thus intrinsically linked to provider experience. Provider stress and burnout contribute to negative patient experiences [11–13,16], while provider bias contributes to inequities in PCMC [13–15]. Further, research shows that people are more likely to be biased when stressed [41]. Yet, there are no documented evidence-based interventions to improve PCMC that address these underlying drivers in an integrated manner. To address this gap, we developed the “*Caring for Providers to Improve Patient Experience (CPIPE)*” intervention, focused on addressing provider stress and bias. CPIPE was designed iteratively guided by literature, behavior change theory—Social Cognitive Theory [42], Trauma Informed System framework [43], and the Ecological Perspective [44]—formative research, and continuous feedback from key stakeholders in Kenya. CPIPE has five strategies—provider training, peer support, mentorship, embedded champions, and leadership engagement. The training, which includes content on PCMC, stress management, dealing with difficult situations, and implicit and explicit bias, aims to increase provider knowledge, skills, and self-efficacy to impact attitudes and behaviors towards preventing burnout, mitigating bias, and improving PCMC. The remaining intervention strategies are intended to create an enabling environment for ongoing behavior change [45]. We piloted *CPIPE* to assess its feasibility, acceptability, and preliminary effectiveness. The intervention development and the implementation process are described elsewhere [46,47]. In this manuscript, we aim to assess the effect of the pilot intervention on key study outcomes. We hypothesized that CPIPE would enable providers to

better manage stress to prevent burnout and increase providers' awareness of their biases and motivation to avoid biased behaviors, which would improve both providers' and patients' experiences and mitigate the effects of their biases, thus reduce inequities in PCMC.

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Study design and setting**

We evaluated CPIPE using a pretest-posttest non-equivalent-control group design embedded within a mixed methods approach [48,49]. The study was conducted in Migori County in western Kenya from August 2021-July 2022. Migori County has a population of about 1.1 million, with a crude birth rate of 30.8 per 1000 [50,51]. It has eight sub-counties, each with a sub-county hospital and several health centers; provider/patient ratio is estimated at 32 nurses and four doctors per 100,000 people, respectively [52]. Most births (89.2%) occur in health facilities in the County [53]. The study setting is previously described [3,54].

In consultation with our community advisory board (CAB), we selected two high volume delivery facilities (facilities with more than 500 births per year)—Migori County Referral Hospital (MCRH) and Kuria West Sub County Hospital (Kehancha)—as intervention sites based on the number of providers available to participate. We then selected four other high volume delivery facilities as control facilities (Rongo, Ntimaru, Awendo, and Isibania sub-county hospitals). Allocation was not random, and more control sites were included because of the relatively fewer providers there compared to MCRH. The characteristics of study facilities are provided in table 1. All maternity providers—inclusive of clinical staff (nurses, midwives, doctors, clinical officers) and support staff (nurse aides, cleaners, etc.) from antenatal, intrapartum, and postnatal care units—in the study facilities were eligible to participate if they did not plan to relocate during the study period.

129

130

==Table 1==

## 131 **Intervention description**

132 The CPIPE intervention strategies are summarized in Figure 1. The training content was first delivered  
 133 through short didactic and interactive sessions over two days, with some content integrated into an  
 134 emergency obstetric and neonatal care (EmONC) simulation to enable providers to apply concepts in the  
 135 context of an emergency. This was followed by monthly refreshers facilitated by the embedded  
 136 champions in their facility. We also created a *WhatsApp* group where resources were shared weekly with  
 137 providers. The peer support groups were cadre-specific in-person groups based on the preferences of the  
 138 providers, facilitated monthly by a peer leader. Groups discussed topics of their choice including  
 139 debriefing on events at the maternity unit, discussing problems and brainstorming solutions; and engaging  
 140 in stress management activities such as mindfulness exercises, singing, and dancing. The mentorship  
 141 strategy was an onsite in-person mentorship model with intentional mentor-mentee pairing based on a  
 142 survey, which identified areas for mentorship and individual needs and preferences. Embedded  
 143 champions in each facility organized intervention activities, delivered training content during monthly  
 144 refreshers, modeled behavior change, and provided support and feedback. A multi-level leadership  
 145 engagement started during the planning phase in the form of a CAB with representation at the County,  
 146 facility, and unit levels, as well as provider and patient representatives. The CAB, which met quarterly,  
 147 provided input on the intervention strategies as well as the implementation and served as a place for high  
 148 level advocacy for issues at the facility level. The intervention was delivered from November 2021-May  
 149 2022. The control group did not receive any intervention during the intervention period.

150

==Figure 1==

## 151 **Data collection**

152 We collected quantitative data through close-ended surveys with providers in the intervention and control

groups before the launch of the intervention (baseline) and after the end of the intervention (endline); qualitative data were collected through in-depth interviews (IDIs) at endline. The intervention timing and data collection are shown in figure 2.

==Figure 2==

**Quantitative survey:** To recruit for the surveys, we first obtained a list of all providers in the maternity unit at each facility. Two female Kenyan research staff (BO and EN), trained in qualitative and quantitative research data collection, approached providers, explained the study, and obtained informed consent. All participants who were approached agreed to participate. Baseline surveys were conducted with 83 providers from August to October 2021, and follow-up surveys with the 80 participants from May to June 2022. Three participants from the baseline cohort were unavailable at endline (two moved outside the County and one on maternity leave). Sample size based on feasibility given pilot study. One-on-one structured surveys were conducted in English, at a private location in the facility, using tablets programmed with REDCap [55]. Interviews lasted 40 to 60 minutes.

**Qualitative:** IDIs were conducted with a sub-set of 20 providers from the intervention sites who participated in the surveys, from July-September 2022, purposively sampled based on facility and position. BO and EN conducted the IDIs in the participant's preferred language (English, Swahili, or Luo), using a semi-structured interview guide. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.

### **Study ethics**

Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Boards of the Kenya Medical Research Institute (SERU 3682) and the University of California, San Francisco (IRB number 17-22783), with additional approvals from the Kenya National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation and the Migori County Commissioner and Director of Health. All participants provided written informed consent and received an incentive of 300 Kenyan shillings (~\$3) for each interview.

## Quantitative Measures

The primary outcomes were (1) stress knowledge, (2) implicit bias knowledge, (3) perceived stress, and (4) burnout. Secondary outcomes were (1) explicit bias, (2) implicit bias, (3) PCMC provision, and (4) physiologic measures of stress: heart rate variability (HRV) and hair cortisol levels. We used preexisting validated or new tools developed by our team to measure all outcomes described in Box 1. Additionally, we collected socio-demographic and job-related data to control for other factors which may explain the intervention outcomes including age, gender, marital status, parity, education, perceived social status, religion, position, years of work experience, workdays and hours, and prior training on stress management, bias, and patient-provider interactions.

==Box 1 ==

## Statistical analysis

We used descriptive statistics (means and proportions) to examine characteristics of the sample and distributions of the outcome variables. We then conducted factor analysis of the perceived stress, burnout, explicit bias, and PCMC items to assess construct validity and Cronbach's alpha to assess internal consistency reliability, before generating summative scores used in subsequent analysis. For respondents missing responses, we used item-mean substitution to impute scale scores [76]. This was done for only two respondents with incomplete data on the explicit bias items. We tested whether there was a change in outcome measure scores from baseline to endline using Wilcoxon paired signed-rank test for both the intervention and control groups. Multivariate linear regression models were used to determine the effect of CPIPE on the outcome measures, controlling for relevant confounders. In the model building process, we first included facility-level random components, but the ICC values were negligible. We thus present the results of the multivariate linear regression models with robust standard errors. A difference-in-



difference analysis was used to estimate the attribution effect of CPIPE on outcome measures. For a given outcome, the intervention effect is the outcome change from baseline to endline for the intervention group minus that of the control group [48]. We used an intent-to-treat design, thus did not account for movement of providers. A p-value of 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Data were analyzed using STATA 15 [77].

## **Qualitative analysis**

IDI transcripts were analyzed using a codebook thematic analysis approach [78–80]. A coding framework, developed deductively based on the interview guide, was iteratively refined with the addition of inductive codes following coding of initial transcripts. A team of four researchers (MG, BO, EN, JK) coded using the coding framework in Dedoose version 8.3.19 [81], with discrepancies addressed by discussion. Codes were queried and analytical memos drafted to identify themes with illustrative quotes.

## **Mixed methods integration**

We used a convergent mixed-methods methods design, with the interview guide developed to help illustrate, expand, and explain the quantitative results [49]. IDI respondents were drawn from the survey sample to connect the findings. We present the quantitative and qualitative findings separately in the results section and then draw on both to interpret the findings in the discussion [82].

## **Results**

### **Participant characteristics at baseline**

The analytic sample is the 80 providers who completed both baseline and endline surveys. There were few differences in the demographic characteristics of participants in the intervention and control groups at baseline; but all, except marital status, were not statistically significant (Table 2). Most participants were

female (65% of control and 80% of intervention), between 30 and 40 years of age (50% of control and 40% of intervention) and married (85% of control and 72% of intervention). Most were nurses or midwives (62.5% of control and 77.5% of intervention), and about a third had been providers for less than 5 years. Less than 3% in both groups reported ever participating in a formal training on stress management; 3% and 5% in the control group reported ever having a training in unconscious bias and interpersonal interactions with patients, respectively, compared to 15% for both trainings in the intervention group.

### **Quantitative results on impact of intervention on study outcomes**

There were no statistically significant differences between the intervention and control groups in any of the key outcomes at baseline. Bivariate analysis showed slight increases from baseline to endline in stress and unconscious bias knowledge scores, as well as decreases in perceived stress and burnout scores in the control group, but these changes were not statistically significant (Table 3). There were, however, statistically significant increases in stress and implicit bias knowledge scores and decreases in stress and burnout levels in the intervention group (Table 3). The average stress knowledge score increased from 7.8 to 9.5, while implicit bias knowledge increased from 8.9 to 10.7 ( $p<0.001$ ) for the intervention group. On the other hand, perceived stress scores decreased from 20.9 to 18.6 ( $P<0.01$ ), while burnout scores decreased from 3.6 to 3.0 for the intervention group ( $p<0.001$ ). There were decreases in the explicit bias scores for both groups, but the magnitude of change was descriptively, though not significantly, larger in the intervention group. The mean score on the low SES vignette decreased from 17.4 to 15.7 ( $p=0.05$ ) in the intervention group compared to 16.30 to 14.9 ( $p=0.08$ ) in the control group. Mean scores for the high SES vignette also decreased from 17.9 to 15.3 ( $p=0.006$ ) in the intervention group compared to 17.0 to 15.0 ( $p=0.01$ ) in the control group. IAT scores decreased for both groups, with a larger and statistically significant difference in the control group ( $p=0.017$ ). Self-reported provision of PCMC increased from 57.8 to 65.5 ( $p=0.03$ ) in the intervention with no statistically significant change in the control group. There were no significant changes in HRV from baseline to endline for both intervention and control groups.

The average hair cortisol level however increased in the control group ( $p < 0.05$ ) but decreased in the intervention group ( $p > 0.05$ ).

In multivariate analysis, controlling for relevant confounders (Table 4), these relationships persisted with greater and statistically significant increases in knowledge scores, decreases in stress, burnout, and explicit bias scores, and increases in self-reported PCMC from the baseline to endline in the intervention group, with smaller or no statistically significant changes in the control group. For example, controlling for other factors, perceived stress scores decreased by 2.5 points from baseline to endline in the intervention group ( $\beta = -2.5$ ; CI: -4.70, -0.30), with no statistically significant change in the control group ( $\beta = -0.76$ ; CI: -2.99, 1.47). Similarly, self-reported PCMC provision increased by 8 points in the intervention group ( $\beta = 8.07$ ; CI: 1.29, 14.84), with no significant change in the control group ( $\beta = -1.71$ ; CI: -5.40, 8.82). The change in IAT scores also remained marginally significant in the control group ( $\beta = -0.25$ ; CI: -0.49, -0.01), but not significant in the intervention group ( $\beta = -0.05$ ; CI: -0.27, 0.17). Differences in HRV and hair cortisol levels were not statistically significant. In difference-in-difference analysis (Table 5), only the percentage difference in implicit bias knowledge was significant, with 36% of the change attributable to the intervention. Although not statistically significant, the intervention accounted for about 81% of the decrease in perceived stress and about a third of the decrease in burnout and explicit bias and increase in PCMC provision.

## Qualitative results

We present themes based on the Social Cognitive Theory constructs—impact on knowledge, skills, self-efficacy, behavior, experience, and environment related to the intervention outcomes—organized by the Ecological Framework’s multiple levels of influence—individual, interpersonal, and institutional levels. Provider accounts of the intervention impacts, however, usually cut across different constructs and levels as reflected in the quotations below and in Table 6.

## Individual level Impacts

At the individual level, participants credited the CPIPE intervention for increasing their knowledge and competency in stress management, bias mitigation, and PCMC provision, which in turn increased their confidence, attitudes, and behaviors, resulting in positive impacts on their personal wellbeing and experiences and patient experience. IDs for quotations represents the facility (FA and FB: facility A and B) and provider type (CP: Clinical Provider and SS: Support staff). These are used to avoid potentially identifying providers.

### *Increased knowledge and competence in stress management*

The training content on stress management was particularly salient and credited for increasing providers' ability to cope with and manage stress. Participants discussed how increased knowledge of different stress management techniques contributed to reductions in their stress level.

*"...whatever I was taught during training has been of great help to me, because initially I had a lot of stress, and when I attended the training, I was taught how to manage the stress that I may encounter; as we talk now, the stress level has reduced and now I am good." FA-SS-0222*

Increased knowledge of stress management was reflected in participants' descriptions of the different techniques they were using to manage stress. These included talking to a trusted person, singing, dancing, self-care activities, breathing, and other mindfulness-based techniques.

*"...the topic of stress really helped me because sometimes I could get so stressed, but I could not tell anyone. So, I came to realize that [in] sharing with a colleague or a person whom I trust, then I can get relieved." FB-CP-0106*

### *Improved management of clinical complications and difficult situations.*

Further, training and mentorship were credited with increasing competence in the clinical management of obstetric emergencies such as post-partum hemorrhage (PPH) and birth asphyxia, both previously reported major stressors. This in turn helped improve providers' confidence when managing emergencies,

leading to decreased fear and anxiety, which improved both clinical and person-centered care during emergencies.

*“It helped me a lot because whenever I have any stress in the wards, then I know how to cope with, especially PPH. The anxiety that I had when I got a PPH at least I can now handle it so well and attend to it properly without fear.” FB-CP-0107*

Providers also reported how the training enabled them to better manage difficult situations, which previously was cited as a reason for disrespect and abuse of patients, contributing to improvements in their interactions with patients in such situations. Increased confidence to manage complications and difficult situations were credited for calming both the provider and the patient.

*“I have really learnt a lot; before attending the trainings, I did not know how to handle difficult patients and mothers in labor. And when I attended the training, I was trained how to handle such difficult cases.” FA-SS-0223*

### ***Improved provider wellbeing and experience***

Participants expressed a positive change in their wellbeing due to a reduction in stress, which they credited to the intervention activities. Some even noted changes in their health following the intervention.

*“I benefited because I was so stressed, I could sit down and just get rumbles in my stomach, but when I attended the training, I got to know how to control my stresses and it really helped me.”*

***FB-SS-0115***

Others recounted how stress reduction techniques helped with managing their anger, which previously would have been directed towards patients. Providers reported higher job satisfaction because of the intervention which made them enjoy coming to work and improved their interactions with patients.

*“... people like me we opened up and we got help from colleagues, something which I did not know that was so easy, that I could be feeling much lighter and happier coming to*

work....Sharing my stresses with my colleagues now made me to enjoy coming to work and my anger towards the patients was also delt with.” **FB-CP-0106**

### ***Increased bias awareness and mitigation behaviors***

The intervention was also credited for increasing providers’ awareness of implicit and explicit bias. This encouraged providers to reflect on their assumptions, which enabled them to control the impact of their biases and avoid discriminatory practices. For example, providers noted improved behaviors including avoiding discrimination based on their perceptions of a patient’s social status or appearance, a common practice before the intervention.

“So, initially we were evaluating [patients] by using unconscious bias and a mother who come very organized we would attend to them very nicely; and those who came unkept, we would not attend to them well. But now we have realized our mistakes and we no longer treat them based on their appearance.” **FA-CP-0208**

Others reported how the training on bias had enabled them to be more open-minded and empathize with their patients, without discriminating based on patient attributes such as ethnicity and age.

“Mostly understanding my clients because when I came to work in this facility, I was so negative. I just already had an opinion with the Kurias (an ethnic group) that they do behave like this or that. So, now am getting to understand them, and it has also helped me to open an avenue where I can begin a conversation; I can understand my clients and my colleagues other than sticking to my opinions that these people are like this, primitive and violent, which may not be so.” **FB-CP-0109**

### **Interpersonal level Impact**

At the interpersonal level, the intervention was credited for improving relationships among providers and between providers and patients leading to a supportive work environment and improved PCMC.

### ***Supportive work environment***

Participants felt that the intervention made them more collaborative and open with colleagues. They also felt the intervention led to more friendly interactions with their colleagues. These facilitated a more supportive work environment, which further improved experiences at work.

*“It made me more open to my colleagues, I listen more and when somebody is talking, I let them talk even if I was rushing somewhere, unless it was an emergency. I give them a listening ear. I spare more time for my colleagues.” FA-CP-0201*

In addition, the mentorship intervention facilitated a non-hierarchical cross-cadre learning which enabled providers to enhance their clinical skills in a supportive environment. The peer support groups also provided an opportunity to debrief, share experiences at work and beyond, and discuss solutions together. These activities also enabled providers to better understand each other.

*“We could discuss the challenges that we experience both at work and out of work then we could brainstorm on the solution to these challenges, we could do some activities like singing and dancing and this I saw to have helped us in change of mind set, you become relieved.” FB-CP - 0110*

Improved relationships occurred within and across cadres. Support staff noted how clinical providers now treated them with more respect. Participants also reported improved relationships with their supervisors, who also noted improvements in their staff. For instance, one maternity-in charge discussed how due to the training she now listens more to the staff, which has improved her understanding of issues they are dealing with and improved their interactions.

*"I have had staffs who have had issues sometimes, but due to such a training, I have been able to give them time to explain where they have been having issues and looking on sharing basis on how best to handle certain situations. Like in a situation where someone failed to report on duty, I ask them to explain what happened and after explanation now I am able to understand that someone can be in such a situation and I am able to tell them that they are able to communicate when caught in such situations and so she appreciated because we did not take any disciplinary measures against her. We understood the situation and... I placed someone to work for her and the issue ended well. Unlike before when I could forward the case for a disciplinary action before listening to the staff. **FB-CP-0101***

#### ***Improved provision of PCMC***

The intervention was credited for influencing providers' approach to patient care. Providers noted how the intervention had impacted general patient-provider interactions by improving providers' knowledge in communicating with patients, friendly service provision, and compassionate care.

*"After the trainings that I received, I was able to handle and talk to women in a friendly way without being biased, and with that the women were getting quality care from me. And during delivery, I could talk to women in a soothing way until the baby is delivered and they all go alive." **FA-CP-0222***

As seen in previous quotes, improved individual provider experience was reported to translate into better interactions with patients thus improving PCMC. Providers shared that these positive changes were appreciated by their patients, leading to more trust, positive perceptions from the community, and increased service utilization.

*".. it has come to a point where community people have started saying that [Facility B] is good, and they no longer go to private facilities. They are saying that 'here we are treated well, nobody is becoming rough'." **FB-CP-0106***



## **Institutional level Impacts**

At the institutional levels, the intervention was credited for improving accountability and advocacy with leadership which served as reinforcement and helped to address some sources of stress. Impacts on all levels led to a more positive facility culture which created an enabling environment for ongoing behavior change.

## ***Increased accountability***

Because most providers in the maternity unit participated in the training, they were holding each other accountable by calling each other out when they behaved out of line. Further, changes in most providers also motivated even potentially resistant providers to change their behaviors. Providers noted reminding each other of their biases to avoid discriminatory care in their facilities.

*“[The] training on unconscious bias, the way somebody appear, you could attend to somebody based on how they look but with time, now that everybody was trained, now when unconscious (comes-up), then your colleagues are able to remind you of the unconscious [bias] training and then you get back to your conscious [self]; you think that I should treat everybody the same. The training has really helped.” FA-CP-0201*

## ***Collective action and advocacy to address sources of stress.***

Many felt the intervention strategy to engage leadership made it easier to implement the project activities and enhanced support for the intervention. Leadership engagement, together with the peer support group strategies, were credited for facilitating collective action and advocacy to address health systems issues including lack of supplies, poor infrastructure, and delayed salaries.

*“You saw it here in our meeting, we had so many challenges but so many of the challenges had been sorted. Like we had a challenge of salaries for casuals, had it been that we did not engage the county then we could have not paid them... it’s because of the study. The issues of supplies you had it mentioned in the meeting. The issue of pharmaceutical and non-pharm came out loudly in our last meeting and out of that meeting, it never took like one month before we could see the supplies trickling into our facility, so I think that leadership engagement has really brought out things to....be done in the right way.” FA-CP-0101*

## **Discussion**

The findings from our mixed methods evaluation shows that the CPIPE intervention contributed to increases in provider knowledge and competency in stress management and bias mitigation, decreases in stress, burnout, and explicit bias levels, and increase in self-reported PCMC. These findings are consistent with our hypothesis. Although there were small changes in the control group, likely due to socially desirable responding, repeated testing, and maturation [48], the greater changes in the intervention group provide evidence for improvements due to the intervention. Further, the difference-in-difference analysis suggests that about a third or more of the changes may be due to the intervention, but the small sample size limited our ability to achieve significance levels for attribution effects. The decrease in average hair cortisol levels in the intervention group compared to an increase in the control group (although not statistically significant likely due to the small sample size), also suggests a potential physiologic impact of the intervention on provider stress levels. Finally, although there were no significant changes in IAT scores in the intervention group, the qualitative data highlights providers’ awareness of their biases and adoption of strategies to mitigate the effects of those biases. Qualitative data also illustrate mechanisms by which the intervention impacted the other study outcomes.

The reduction in provider stress and burnout levels is a critical finding, given the intervention did not directly address stressors. One potential pathway for this effect is that the intervention influenced how providers perceived these stressors. It is recognized that people exposed to the same stressors may have different physiological and psychological responses, depending on how they perceive the stressors [22]. Further, the training provided participants with knowledge and tangible skills to cope with stress and prevent burnout. Thus, although stress is unavoidable in the life of healthcare workers due to the nature of their work, the impact of stressors can be diminished by equipping them with the tools necessary to change their perception and manage the stressors and promoting positive coping mechanisms. Qualitative data also show that the intervention contributed indirectly to addressing some of the stressors, lessening the frequency of exposure to stressors. Prior interventions to prevent burnout among providers have leveraged similar mechanisms including individual-focused strategies (such as stress management training, self-care workshops, mindfulness, etc.) as well as structural approaches (e.g., workload or schedule changes and improving workplace environment) [83].

The decreased explicit bias scores are likely due to the increased knowledge of bias, which qualitative data show was being translated into action to avoid discrimination and provide PCMC to all patients regardless of their social status. The non-significant decrease in IAT scores in the intervention group, on the other hand, reflects the implicit bias training goal of increasing awareness and mitigation behaviors, rather than removing the underlying associative process [84]. Additionally, short term implicit bias trainings are insufficient to root out deeply held biases. Instead, the goal is to raise people's awareness of implicit bias to facilitate the development of structural changes to mitigate the effects of individual biases [41,85]. The significant reduction in IAT scores in the control group was, however, unexpected; although likely due to the low test-retest reliability of the IAT [86,87]. Prior studies have shown lower subsequent IAT scores regardless of intervention exposure, calling for caution with repeated IAT measures [86,87]. The CPIPE intervention included several components recommended for integrating implicit bias recognition and management into health professions curricula, including, creating a safe and

nonthreatening learning context, increasing knowledge about the science of implicit bias, emphasizing how implicit bias influences behaviors and patient outcomes, increasing self-awareness of existing biases, improving conscious efforts to overcome implicit bias, and enhancing awareness of how implicit bias influences others [88]. These likely contributed to the positive effects of the intervention with evidence that providers were more aware of their biases and adopting strategies to mitigate their effects. Increased bias awareness is a first step towards mitigation. Further, providers were learning how to replace biased responses with responses more consistent with their goals, which can help mitigate the effects of bias [85]. Emerging research also suggest that it is possible to reduce the effects of people's bias through activities that elevate the alternate selves and goals that people endorse, without actually removing their deep-seated associative biases—referred to as sidelining implicit bias—due to the inherently complex and often contradictory nature of people [89,90].

The CPIPE outcomes are a result of the synergistic effects of the different intervention strategies. As posited in the social cognitive theory, people can change their behavior despite obstacles if they feel capable and confident in their ability to engage in the behavior (self-efficacy), believe the change benefits them (outcome expectancies), and if there are tangible goals, positive role models, and reinforcement [45]. Further, learning and behavior change occurs in a social context with a dynamic and reciprocal interaction of the person, environment, and behavior [42]. Training contributes to self-efficacy and outcome expectancies, and is necessary, but often insufficient by itself to achieve and sustain behavior and facility culture change. Yet, most interventions on PCMC continue to focus on only training, with most content focused on only respectful maternity care [91]. CPIPE is unique because, in addition to the unique training content and delivery, the intervention package included theory and evidence-based multilevel integrated strategies, which played a critical role in the success of the intervention.

Peer support programs, while quite common among patient groups, are not as widely utilized among healthcare workers in SSA [92–97]. The cadre-specific in-person peer support groups provided an

opportunity for maternity providers to offer emotional and social support, share knowledge and experience, practice coping mechanisms to reduce stress, and discuss ways to address bias and provide PCMC. Mentoring on the other hand an accepted approach to support ongoing professional development guided by mentees learning needs [98–100]. The CPIPE onsite mentorship program created new relationships between providers contributing to positive environment for providing compassionate care, while improving providers’ competencies to manage clinical emergencies. Embedded champions are recognized as central to the success of implementation and behavior change [101–103]. CPIPE embedded champions served as trainers, mentors, conveners, liaisons, role models, and advocates, which contributed to the intervention success, increased self-efficacy of other providers, and provided reinforcement for behavior change [42]. Finally, leadership engagement is critical for successful implementation, ownership, and sustainability of any intervention [104]. In CPIPE, leadership engagement from the onset contributed to county buy in, facilitated implementation, and granted to access leadership such that concerns raised at peer support meetings could be brought up to management for resolution. The reciprocal interactions of individual behavior, peers, mentors, mentees, embedded champions, and leaders thus all created an enabling environment for learning and reinforcing behavior change.

Our findings have several implications. First, given increasing documentation of stress and burnout among healthcare workers [27,29,31,105], CPIPE provides an example of a theory and evidence-based approach to prevent burnout, promote the wellbeing of providers, and improve quality of care. Second, given the role of bias in healthcare inequities and the dearth of evidence on effective ways to address it [15,17,33], the CPIPE intervention will be valuable in efforts to promote health equity through bias awareness and mitigation. Third, there is still a major gap in theory and evidence-based interventions to promote responsive, compassionate, and respectful maternity care [91,106]. This work thus extends the limited research on interventions to improve PCMC, with the added strength of addressing equity and provider wellbeing and experience. Finally, CPIPE provides an example of how to facilitate a supportive

workplace culture that both motivates and holds providers accountable for specific behaviors. Planning for and creating policies within health systems for the implementation of such interventions could thus have multiplicative effects beyond the outcomes of this study.

## **Limitations and strengths**

First, given this was a pilot study with a small sample in one setting to assess feasibility, generalizability is limited. The small sample size also likely contributed to the non-significant difference-in-difference results. Second, individual provider randomization was not appropriate given the facility level activities and high potential for contamination. Thus, we utilized a cluster design; but exact matching of facilities was not possible due the highly variable size of the facilities in the study county. This resulted in some differences between the intervention and control sites. Third, self-reported measures are prone to social desirability bias. We included the IAT and physiologic measures of stress to address this limitation, but the low test-retest reliability of the IAT and acute nature of HRV (influenced by what is happening in the moment) limited their utility, while people's reluctance to have their hair cut significantly reduced the analytic sample for hair cortisol. Finally, although the goal is to improve patient experience, patient interviews were not included in this pilot phase and the one-time assessment period at the end of the intervention limits our ability to assess sustained effects.

Nonetheless, the study has several strengths. To our knowledge, this is the first study to show the effect of an integrated provider targeted intervention on perceived stress, burnout, and bias—key drivers of inequities in PCMC. The findings address a gap in efforts to improve both patient and provider experience as well as advance health equity. Second, despite limitations of not being able to randomize individually, the pretest-posttest control group design allowed us to address common threats to internal validity, thus increasing the internal validity of the results [48]. We also used validated measures to assess our outcomes further increasing internal validity. Despite the limitation of not including patient

interviews, the self-reported PCMC results are promising as prior research has shown that provider reports in this setting are close enough to patient reports, despite the danger of social desirability bias [13,14,16]. Finally, the convergent mixed-methods methods approach provided a more nuanced understanding of the impact of the intervention. The success of this pilot sets it up for testing in a larger sample with patient reported experience measures and outcomes and with longer term follow-up to strengthen the evidence for effectiveness, generalizability, and sustainability.

## Conclusion

CPIPE is a theory and evidence-based integrated provider intervention that addresses key interrelated drivers of poor PCMC—provider stress, burnout, and implicit and explicit bias—as a way of improving and achieving equity in PCMC. Through this pilot, we have demonstrated the preliminary effectiveness of CPIPE. The evaluation results show strong promise of its ability to reduce provider stress and burnout, as well as to mitigate the effects of explicit and implicit bias to improve PCMC for the most vulnerable. Further, the multilevel intervention strategies contributed to individual provider and facility level changes that created an environment conducive for providing responsive, respectful, and compassionate maternity care. The findings from this study have great promise for other settings seeking to improve both provider and patient experience, while centering the experience of the most vulnerable patients. Future studies in more diverse settings will strengthen the evidence to inform programs and policies on such interventions.

## Abbreviations

CPIPE: Caring for providers to improve patient experience; PCMC: Person-centered maternity care; SES: Socioeconomic status; IAT: Implicit association test; HRV: Heart rate variability; FA: Facility A; FB: Facility B; CP: clinical provider; SS: Support staff.

## Author contributions

PAA conceptualized and designed the study. BAO, ENO collected the data. JO, MG, BAO, ENO, JK, PAA contributed to data analysis and interpretation. All authors contributed to study implementation and writing of the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript for submission.

# **Conflict of interest statement**

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

# **Funding**

This study is funded by a Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development K99/ R00 grant to PA [K99HD093798/R00HD093798]. The funders had no role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

# **Acknowledgements**

We thank the Migori County, sub-county, and health facility leadership, and the providers who participated in the study. We are especially grateful to the four CPIPE Embedded Champions (Joash Mayuya, Mary Khaemba, Gladys Nyaberi, and Beatrice Bange), who facilitated activities at their facilities.

# **References**

1. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2001. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK222274/>
2. Tunçalp □., Were W, MacLennan C, Oladapo O, Gülmezoglu A, Bahl R, et al. Quality of care for pregnant women and newborns—the WHO vision. BJOG: Int J Obstet Gy. 2015;122: 1045–1049. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.13451
3. Afulani PA, Diamond-Smith N, Golub G, Sudhinaraset M. Development of a tool to measure person-centered maternity care in developing settings: validation in a rural and urban Kenyan population. Reprod Health. 2017;14. doi:10.1186/s12978-017-0381-7



4. Sudhinaraset M, Afulani P, Diamond-Smith N, Bhattacharyya S, Donnay F, Montagu D. Advancing a conceptual model to improve maternal health quality: The Person-Centered Care Framework for Reproductive Health Equity. *Gates Open Res.* 2017;1: 1. doi:10.12688/gatesopenres.12756.1
5. Abuya T, Warren CE, Miller N, Njuki R, Ndwiga C, Maranga A, et al. Exploring the Prevalence of Disrespect and Abuse during Childbirth in Kenya. *PLOS ONE.* 2015;10: e0123606. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0123606
6. Bohren MA, Mehrtash H, Fawole B, Maung TM, Balde MD, Maya E, et al. How women are treated during facility-based childbirth in four countries: a cross-sectional study with labour observations and community-based surveys. *The Lancet.* 2019 [cited 12 Oct 2019]. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31992-0
7. Afulani PA, Phillips B, Aborigo RA, Moyer CA. Person-centred maternity care in low-income and middle-income countries: analysis of data from Kenya, Ghana, and India. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2019;7: e96–e109. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30403-0
8. Diamond-Smith N, Treleaven E, Murthy N, Sudhinaraset M. Women’s empowerment and experiences of mistreatment during childbirth in facilities in Lucknow, India: results from a cross-sectional study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2017;17: 335. doi:10.1186/s12884-017-1501-7
9. Afulani PA, Sayi TS, Montagu D. Predictors of person-centered maternity care: the role of socioeconomic status, empowerment, and facility type. *BMC Health Services Research.* 2018;18: 360. doi:10.1186/s12913-018-3183-x
10. Montagu D, Ladrian A, Kumar V, Phillips BS, Singah S, Mishra S, et al. Patient-experience during delivery in public health facilities in Uttar Pradesh, India. *Health Policy Plan.* 2019 [cited 21 Aug 2019]. doi:10.1093/heapol/czz067
11. Warren CE, Njue R, Ndwiga C, Abuya T. Manifestations and drivers of mistreatment of women during childbirth in Kenya: implications for measurement and developing interventions. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth.* 2017;17: 102. doi:10.1186/s12884-017-1288-6
12. Sen G, Reddy B, Iyer A. Beyond measurement: the drivers of disrespect and abuse in obstetric care. *Reprod Health Matters.* 2018;26: 6–18. doi:10.1080/09688080.2018.1508173
13. Afulani PA, Kelly AM, Buback L, Asunka J, Kirumbi L, Lyndon A. Providers’ perceptions of disrespect and abuse during childbirth: a mixed-methods study in Kenya. *Health Policy and Planning.* 2020 [cited 10 Mar 2020]. doi:10.1093/heapol/czaa009
14. Afulani PA, Buback L, Kelly AM, Kirumbi L, Cohen CR, Lyndon A. Providers’ perceptions of communication and women’s autonomy during childbirth: a mixed methods study in Kenya. *Reproductive Health.* 2020;17: 85. doi:10.1186/s12978-020-0909-0
15. Afulani PA, Ogolla BA, Oboke EN, Ongeru L, Weiss SJ, Lyndon A, et al. Understanding disparities in person-centred maternity care: the potential role of provider implicit and explicit bias. *Health Policy and Planning.* 2021 [cited 28 Jan 2021]. doi:10.1093/heapol/czaa190
16. Afulani PA, Aborigo RA, Nutor JJ, Okiring J, Kuwolamo I, Ogolla BA, et al. Self-reported provision of person-centred maternity care among providers in Kenya and Ghana: scale validation

- 641 and examination of associated factors. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2021;6: e007415. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-  
642 2021-007415
- 643 17. Afulani PA, Okiring J, Aborigo RA, Nutor JJ, Kuwolamo I, Dorzie JBK, et al. Provider implicit and  
644 explicit bias in person-centered maternity care: a cross-sectional study with maternity providers in  
645 Northern Ghana. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2023;23: 254. doi:10.1186/s12913-023-09261-6
- 646 18. Maslach C, Schaufeli WB, Leiter MP. Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2001;52: 397–  
647 422. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397
- 648 19. Shirom A. Job-related burnout: A review. *Handbook of occupational health psychology*.  
649 Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association; 2003. pp. 245–264.  
650 doi:10.1037/10474-012
- 651 20. Public Health England. Interventions to prevent burnout in high risk individuals: evidence review -  
652 Publications - GOV.UK. 2016 [cited 26 Oct 2016]. Available:  
653 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/interventions-to-prevent-burnout-in-high-risk-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/interventions-to-prevent-burnout-in-high-risk-individuals-evidence-review)  
654 [individuals-evidence-review](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/interventions-to-prevent-burnout-in-high-risk-individuals-evidence-review)
- 655 21. Halbesleben JRB, editor. *Handbook of Stress and Burnout in Health Care*. 3 edition. New York:  
656 Nova Science Pub Inc; 2008.
- 657 22. McEwen BS. Stressed or stressed out: What is the difference? *J Psychiatry Neurosci*. 2005;30: 315–  
658 318.
- 659 23. Khalil D. Violence against midwives in Cape Town. *African Journal of Midwifery and Women’s*  
660 *Health*. 2009;3: 37–40. doi:10.12968/ajmw.2009.3.1.39414
- 661 24. Filby A, McConville F, Portela A. What Prevents Quality Midwifery Care? A Systematic Mapping  
662 of Barriers in Low and Middle Income Countries from the Provider Perspective. *PLOS ONE*.  
663 2016;11: e0153391. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0153391
- 664 25. Getahun M, Oboke EN, Ogolla BA, Kinyua J, Onger L, Sterling M, et al. Sources of Stress and  
665 Coping Mechanisms: Experiences of Maternal Health Care Providers in Western Kenya. *medRxiv*;  
666 2022. p. 2022.09.27.22280433. doi:10.1101/2022.09.27.22280433
- 667 26. Lancet T. Physician burnout: a global crisis. *The Lancet*. 2019;394: 93. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
668 6736(19)31573-9
- 669 27. Leo CG, Sabina S, Tumolo MR, Bodini A, Ponzini G, Sabato E, et al. Burnout Among Healthcare  
670 Workers in the COVID 19 Era: A Review of the Existing Literature. *Frontiers in Public Health*.  
671 2021;9: 1661. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.750529
- 672 28. Dubale BW, Friedman LE, Chemali Z, Denninger JW, Mehta DH, Alem A, et al. Systematic review  
673 of burnout among healthcare providers in sub-Saharan Africa. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19: 1247.  
674 doi:10.1186/s12889-019-7566-7
- 675 29. Nutor JJ, Aborigo RA, Okiring J, Kuwolamo I, Dorzie JBK, Getahun M, et al. Individual and  
676 situational predictors of psychological and physiological stress and burnout among maternity  
677 providers in Northern Ghana. *PLOS ONE*. 2022;17: e0278457. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0278457

- 678 30. Afulani PA, Nutor JJ, Agbadi P, Gyamerah AO, Musana J, Aborigo RA, et al. Job satisfaction  
679 among healthcare workers in Ghana and Kenya during the COVID-19 pandemic: Role of  
680 perceived preparedness, stress, and burnout. PLOS Global Public Health. 2021;1: e0000022.  
681 doi:10.1371/journal.pgph.0000022
- 682 31. Afulani PA, Onger L, Kinyua J, Temmerman M, Mendes WB, Weiss SJ. Psychological and  
683 physiological stress and burnout among maternity providers in a rural county in Kenya: individual  
684 and situational predictors. BMC Public Health. 2021;21: 453. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-10453-0
- 685 32. Muriithi JW, Kariuki PW. Work-related Determinants of Nurses' Burnout in Pumwani Maternity  
686 Hospital, Nairobi City County, Kenya. Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health. 2020;  
687 36–49.
- 688 33. Blair IV, Steiner JF, Havranek EP. Unconscious (Implicit) Bias and Health Disparities: Where Do  
689 We Go from Here? Perm J. 2011;15: 71–78.
- 690 34. Daumeyer NM, Onyeador IN, Brown X, Richeson JA. Consequences of attributing discrimination  
691 to implicit vs. explicit bias. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. 2019;84: 103812.  
692 doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2019.04.010
- 693 35. van Ryn M, Burke J. The effect of patient race and socio-economic status on physicians'  
694 perceptions of patients. Social Science & Medicine. 2000;50: 813–828. doi:10.1016/S0277-  
695 9536(99)00338-X
- 696 36. Bernheim SM, Ross JS, Krumholz HM, Bradley EH. Influence of Patients' Socioeconomic Status  
697 on Clinical Management Decisions: A Qualitative Study. The Annals of Family Medicine. 2008;6:  
698 53–59. doi:10.1370/afm.749
- 699 37. Arpey NC, Gaglioti AH, Rosenbaum ME. How Socioeconomic Status Affects Patient Perceptions  
700 of Health Care: A Qualitative Study. J Prim Care Community Health. 2017;8: 169–175.  
701 doi:10.1177/2150131917697439
- 702 38. Brekke KR, Holmås TH, Monstad K, Straume OR. Socio-economic status and physicians' treatment  
703 decisions. Health Economics. 2018;27: e77–e89. doi:10.1002/hec.3621
- 704 39. Moore PJ, Sickel AE, Malat J, Williams D, Jackson J, Adler NE. Psychosocial Factors in Medical  
705 and Psychological Treatment Avoidance: The Role of the Doctor–Patient Relationship. J  
706 Health Psychol. 2004;9: 421–433. doi:10.1177/1359105304042351
- 707 40. Lazar M, Davenport L. Barriers to Health Care Access for Low Income Families: A Review of  
708 Literature. Journal of Community Health Nursing. 2018;35: 28–37.  
709 doi:10.1080/07370016.2018.1404832
- 710 41. Mendes WB, Koslov K. Brittle smiles: positive biases toward stigmatized and outgroup targets. J  
711 Exp Psychol Gen. 2013;142: 923–933. doi:10.1037/a0029663
- 712 42. Bandura A. Health promotion by social cognitive means. Health Educ Behav. 2004;31: 143–164.  
713 doi:10.1177/1090198104263660

43. Bloom SL. Organizational Stress and Trauma-Informed Services. In: Levin BL, Becker MA, editors. A Public Health Perspective of Women's Mental Health. Springer New York; 2010. pp. 295–311. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-1526-9\_15
44. McLeroy KR, Bibeau D, Steckler A, Glanz K. An Ecological Perspective on Health Promotion Programs. Health Education & Behavior. 1988;15: 351–377. doi:10.1177/109019818801500401
45. Glanz K, Rimer KB. Theory at a Glance: A Guide for Health Promotion Practice. National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. NIH Pub. No. 97-3896. Washington, DC: NIH. 1997.
46. Afulani PA, Oboke EN, Ogolla BA, Getahun M, Kinyua J, Oluoch I, et al. Caring for providers to improve patient experience (CPIPE): intervention development process. Global Health Action. 2023;16: 2147289. doi:10.1080/16549716.2022.2147289
47. Ogolla BA, Onger L, Oboke EN, Getahun M, Kinyua J, Iscar O, et al. Implementation of the caring for providers to improve patient experience (CPIPE) intervention in Migori County, Kenya: challenges, successes, and lessons. SocArXiv; 2023. doi:10.31235/osf.io/abgr3
48. Rossi PH, Lipsey MW, Freeman HE. Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. SAGE Publications; 2003.
49. Creswell JW. A Concise Introduction to Mixed Methods Research. 1 edition. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc; 2014.
50. Infotrak. Migori County | County Trak Kenya. 2022 [cited 20 Jan 2023]. Available: <http://countytrak.infotrakresearch.com/migori-county/>
51. Statistica. Kenya: crude birth rate by county. In: Statista [Internet]. 2019 [cited 20 Jan 2023]. Available: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1319007/crude-birth-rate-in-kenya-by-county/>
52. HPP. Health Policy Project Kenya County Health Fact Sheets. 2015 [cited 2 Jun 2017]. Available: <https://www.healthpolicyproject.com/index.cfm?id=kenyaCHFS>
53. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, Ministry of Health, Kenya, National AIDS Control Council, Kenya, Kenya Medical Research Institute, National Council for Population and Development, Kenya, ICF International. Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2022 - Key Indicators Report (English). The DHS Program, Rockville, MD, USA.; 2023. Available: <https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-PR143-Preliminary-Reports-Key-Indicators-Reports.cfm>
54. Afulani PA, Kirumbi L, Lyndon A. What makes or mars the facility-based childbirth experience: thematic analysis of women's childbirth experiences in western Kenya. Reprod Health. 2017;14: 180. doi:10.1186/s12978-017-0446-7
55. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap) - A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform. 2009;42: 377–381. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
56. Broman-Fulks J, Kelso K. Stress Management. 2nd ed. Wellness Literacy. 2nd ed. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co ,U.S.; 2012.

- 752 57. Surinder S, Meyer C. quiz: test your knowledge oF unconscious bias. 2018. Available:  
753 <https://fsae.memberclicks.net/assets/DEI/Quiz-Unconscious%20Bias.pdf>
- 754 58. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. *J Health Soc Behav.*  
755 1983;24: 385–396.
- 756 59. Manzar MD, Salahuddin M, Peter S, Alghadir A, Anwer S, Bahammam AS, et al. Psychometric  
757 properties of the perceived stress scale in Ethiopian university students. *BMC Public Health.*  
758 2019;19: 41. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-6310-z
- 759 60. Shirom A, Melamed S. A comparison of the construct validity of two burnout measures in two  
760 groups of professionals. *International Journal of Stress Management.* 2006;13: 176–200.  
761 doi:10.1037/1072-5245.13.2.176
- 762 61. Gerber M, Colledge F, Mücke M, Schilling R, Brand S, Ludyga S. Psychometric properties of the  
763 Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure (SMBM) among adolescents: results from three cross-  
764 sectional studies. *BMC Psychiatry.* 2018;18: 266. doi:10.1186/s12888-018-1841-5
- 765 62. Lundgren-Nilsson Å, Jonsdottir IH, Pallant J, Ahlborg G. Internal construct validity of the Shirom-  
766 Melamed Burnout Questionnaire (SMBQ). *BMC Public Health.* 2012;12: 1. doi:10.1186/1471-  
767 2458-12-1
- 768 63. Buback L, Kinyua J, Akinyi B, Walker D, Afulani PA. Provider perceptions of lack of supportive  
769 care during childbirth: A mixed methods study in Kenya. *Health Care for Women International.*  
770 2021;0: 1–22. doi:10.1080/07399332.2021.1961776
- 771 64. Haider AH, Schneider EB, Sriram N, Scott VK, Swoboda SM, Zogg CK, et al. Unconscious Race  
772 and Class Biases among Registered Nurses: Vignette-Based Study Using Implicit Association  
773 Testing. *J Am Coll Surg.* 2015;220: 1077-1086.e3. doi:10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2015.01.065
- 774 65. Green AR, Carney DR, Pallin DJ, Ngo LH, Raymond KL, Iezzoni LI, et al. Implicit bias among  
775 physicians and its prediction of thrombolysis decisions for black and white patients. *J Gen Intern*  
776 *Med.* 2007;22: 1231–1238. doi:10.1007/s11606-007-0258-5
- 777 66. Inquisit Lab. Inquisit Lab Overview. [cited 3 Nov 2022]. Available:  
778 <https://www.millisecond.com/products/lab>
- 779 67. Greenwald AG, McGhee DE, Schwartz JLK. Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition:  
780 The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 1998;74: 1464–1480.  
781 doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464
- 782 68. Nosek BA, Greenwald AG, Banaji MR. The Implicit Association Test at Age 7: A Methodological  
783 and Conceptual Review. In: Bargh JA, editor. *Social psychology and the unconscious: The*  
784 *automaticity of higher mental processes.* New York, NY, US: Psychology Press; 2007. pp. 265–  
785 292.
- 786 69. Lane KA, Banaji MR, Nosek BA, Greenwald AG. Understanding and Using the Implicit  
787 Association Test: IV: What We Know (So Far) about the Method. In: Wittenbrink B, Schwarz N,  
788 editors. *Implicit measures of attitudes.* New York, NY, US: Guilford Press; 2007. pp. 59–102.



70. Kim H-G, Cheon E-J, Bai D-S, Lee YH, Koo B-H. Stress and Heart Rate Variability: A Meta-Analysis and Review of the Literature. *Psychiatry Investig.* 2018;15: 235–245. doi:10.30773/pi.2017.08.17
71. Russell E, Koren G, Rieder M, Van Uum S. Hair cortisol as a biological marker of chronic stress: Current status, future directions and unanswered questions. *Psychoneuroendocrinology.* 2012;37: 589–601. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2011.09.009
72. Järvelin-Pasanen S, Sinikallio S, Tarvainen MP. Heart rate variability and occupational stress-systematic review. *Ind Health.* 2018;56: 500–511. doi:10.2486/indhealth.2017-0190
73. Perrotta AS, Jeklin AT, Hives BA, Meanwell LE, Warburton DER. Validity of the Elite HRV Smartphone Application for Examining Heart Rate Variability in a Field-Based Setting. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2017;31: 2296–2302. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000001841
74. Lennartsson A-K, Jonsdottir I, Sjörs A. Low heart rate variability in patients with clinical burnout. *International Journal of Psychophysiology.* 2016;110: 171–178. doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2016.08.005
75. Kirschbaum C, Tietze A, Skoluda N, Dettenborn L. Hair as a retrospective calendar of cortisol production—Increased cortisol incorporation into hair in the third trimester of pregnancy. *Psychoneuroendocrinology.* 2009;34: 32–37. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2008.08.024
76. Lee MR, Bartholow BD, McCarthy DM, Pedersen SL, Sher KJ. Two Alternative Approaches to Conventional Person-Mean Imputation Scoring of the Self-Rating of the Effects of Alcohol Scale (SRE). *Psychol Addict Behav.* 2015;29: 231–236. doi:10.1037/adb0000015
77. StataCorp LLC. Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX; 2017.
78. Braun V, Clarke V. One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology.* 2021;18: 328–352. doi:10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238
79. Jansen D. What Is Thematic Analysis? Explainer + Examples. In: Grad Coach [Internet]. 16 Apr 2021 [cited 21 Mar 2023]. Available: <https://gradcoach.com/what-is-thematic-analysis/>
80. Sud D. Thematic analysis part 2: three schools of thematic analysis and study design recommendations. In: Students 4 Best Evidence [Internet]. 6 Mar 2020 [cited 21 Mar 2023]. Available: <https://s4be.cochrane.org/blog/2020/03/06/thematic-analysis-part-2-three-schools-of-thematic-analysis-and-study-design-recommendations/>
81. SocioCultural Research Consultants, LLC. Dedoose Version 8.3.19, cloud application for managing, analyzing, and presenting qualitative and mixed method research data. Los Angeles, CA; 2021. Available: [www.dedoose.com](http://www.dedoose.com).
82. Fetters MD, Curry LA, Creswell JW. Achieving Integration in Mixed Methods Designs—Principles and Practices. *Health Serv Res.* 2013;48: 2134–2156. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12117
83. Zhang X, Song Y, Jiang T, Ding N, Shi T. Interventions to reduce burnout of physicians and nurses: An overview of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Medicine.* 2020;99: e20992. doi:10.1097/MD.0000000000002092

- 827 84. Bower KM, Kramer MB, Warren N, Ahmed S, Callaghan-Koru J, Stierman E, et al. Development  
828 of an Instrument to Measure Awareness and Mitigation of Bias in Maternal Health Care. *American*  
829 *Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology MFM*. 2023;0. doi:10.1016/j.ajogmf.2023.100872
- 830 85. Devine PG, Forscher PS, Austin AJ, Cox WTL. Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A  
831 prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 2012;48: 1267–  
832 1278. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003
- 833 86. Greenwald AG, Nosek BA, Banaji MR. Understanding and using the implicit association test: I. An  
834 improved scoring algorithm. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2003;85: 197–216.
- 835 87. Patrick S. Forscher. A brief intellectual history of implicit bias. In: Patrick S. Forscher [Internet]. 17  
836 Jan 2023 [cited 26 Jan 2023]. Available: [https://persistentastonishment.blogspot.com/2023/01/a-](https://persistentastonishment.blogspot.com/2023/01/a-brief-intellectual-history-of.html)  
837 [brief-intellectual-history-of.html](https://persistentastonishment.blogspot.com/2023/01/a-brief-intellectual-history-of.html)
- 838 88. Sukhera J, Watling C. A Framework for Integrating Implicit Bias Recognition Into Health  
839 Professions Education. *Academic Medicine*. 2018;93: 35. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000001819
- 840 89. Okonofua JA, Saadatian K, Ocampo J, Ruiz M, Oxholm PD. A scalable empathic supervision  
841 intervention to mitigate recidivism from probation and parole. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*.  
842 2021;118: e2018036118. doi:10.1073/pnas.2018036118
- 843 90. Okonofua JA, Perez AD, Darling-Hammond S. When policy and psychology meet: Mitigating the  
844 consequences of bias in schools. *Sci Adv*. 2020;6: eaba9479. doi:10.1126/sciadv.aba9479
- 845 91. Diamond-Smith N, Lin S, Peca E, Walker D. A landscaping review of interventions to promote  
846 respectful maternal care in Africa: Opportunities to advance innovation and accountability.  
847 *Midwifery*. 2022;115: 103488. doi:10.1016/j.midw.2022.103488
- 848 92. Funck-Brentano I, Dalban C, Veber F, Quartier P, Hefez S, Costagliola D, et al. Evaluation of a peer  
849 support group therapy for HIV-infected adolescents. *AIDS*. 2005;19: 1501–1508.  
850 doi:10.1097/01.aids.0000183124.86335.0a
- 851 93. Stevens-Simon C, Dolgan JI, Kelly L, Singer D. The effect of monetary incentives and peer support  
852 groups on repeat adolescent pregnancies. A randomized trial of the Dollar-a-Day Program. *JAMA*.  
853 1997;277: 977–982.
- 854 94. Suresh R, Alam A, Karkossa Z. Using Peer Support to Strengthen Mental Health During the  
855 COVID-19 Pandemic: A Review. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*. 2021;12. Available:  
856 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsy.2021.714181>
- 857 95. Pereira L, Radovic T, Haykal K. Peer support programs in the fields of medicine and nursing: a  
858 systematic search and narrative review. *Can Med Educ J*. 2021;12: 113–125.  
859 doi:10.36834/cmej.71129
- 860 96. Peterson U, Bergström G, Samuelsson M, Åsberg M, Nygren Å. Reflecting peer-support groups in  
861 the prevention of stress and burnout: randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*.  
862 2008;63: 506–516.

97. Busch IM, Scott SD, Connors C, Story AR, Acharya B, Wu AW. The Role of Institution-Based Peer Support for Health Care Workers Emotionally Affected by Workplace Violence. *JCJQPS*. 2021;47: 146–156. doi:10.1016/j.jcjq.2020.11.005
98. Feyissa GT, Balabanova D, Woldie M. How Effective are Mentoring Programs for Improving Health Worker Competence and Institutional Performance in Africa? A Systematic Review of Quantitative Evidence. *J Multidiscip Healthc*. 2019;12: 989–1005. doi:10.2147/JMDH.S228951
99. Hookmani AA, Lalani N, Sultan N, Zubairi A, Hussain A, Hasan BS, et al. Development of an on-job mentorship programme to improve nursing experience for enhanced patient experience of compassionate care. *BMC Nursing*. 2021;20: 175. doi:10.1186/s12912-021-00682-4
100. Tourigny L, Pulich M. A Critical Examination of Formal and Informal Mentoring Among Nurses. *The Health Care Manager*. 2005;24: 68.
101. Damschroder LJ, Banaszak-Holl J, Kowalski CP, Forman J, Saint S, Krein SL. The role of the champion in infection prevention: results from a multisite qualitative study. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2009;18: 434–440. doi:10.1136/qshc.2009.034199
102. Soo S, Berta W, Baker GR. Role of champions in the implementation of patient safety practice change. *Healthc Q*. 2009;12 Spec No Patient: 123–128. doi:10.12927/hcq.2009.20979
103. Shaw EK, Howard J, West DR, Crabtree BF, Nease DE, Tutt B, et al. The Role of the Champion in Primary Care Change Efforts. *J Am Board Fam Med*. 2012;25: 676–685. doi:10.3122/jabfm.2012.05.110281
104. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implementation Science*. 2009;4: 50. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-50
105. De Hert S. Burnout in Healthcare Workers: Prevalence, Impact and Preventative Strategies. *Local Reg Anesth*. 2020;13: 171–183. doi:10.2147/LRA.S240564
106. Diamond-Smith N, Walker D, Afulani PA, Donnay F, Lin S (Pei Y, Peca E, et al. The Case for Using a Behavior Change Model to Design Interventions to Promote Respectful Maternal Care. *Global Health: Science and Practice*. 2023 [cited 25 Jan 2023]. doi:10.9745/GHSP-D-22-00278



## Captions

Figure 1: CPIPE Intervention Strategies

Figure 2: Flowchart of study activities

Box 1: Study outcome measures

Table 1: Characteristics of Study facilities

Table 2: Baseline characteristic of the study participants


Table 3: Estimates of primary outcomes at baseline and endline for control and intervention groups

Table 4: Multivariate analysis of primary outcomes stratified by study group

Table 5: Difference in difference analysis of CPIPE effect on different outcomes


Table 6: Intervention Impact themes and representative quotes

Figure 1: CPIPE Intervention Strategies



903

Figure 2: Flowchart of study activities



904

<b>Box 1: Study outcome measures</b>	
<b>Stress knowledge</b>	A 13-question knowledge of stress and stress management assessment adapted from existing questions [56]. Each multiple-choice question had one correct answer; responses were coded into binary (right or wrong) and summed to create a composite stress knowledge score. Scores range from 0 to 13; higher scores indicate higher stress knowledge. <i>Cronbach alpha for the 13 items in the study sample at baseline was 0.69.</i>
<b>Implicit bias knowledge</b>	A 15-question assessment of unconscious bias adapted from existing questions [57]. Each multiple-choice question had one correct answer; responses were coded into binary (right or wrong) and summed to create a composite implicit bias knowledge score. Scores range from 0 to 15; higher scores indicate higher implicit bias knowledge. <i>Cronbach alpha for the 15 items in the study sample at baseline was 0.75.</i>
<b>Perceived Stress</b>	The 10-item Cohen Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) on people's feelings and thoughts in the past month [58]. The PSS has undergone substantial testing for validity and reliability in different populations including in the study setting [31,29,30,59]. Questions capture how nervous or stressed, unpredictable, uncontrollable, and overloaded respondents find their lives; response scales are 0 (never) to 4 (very often). Summative cores are created after recoding all response to the same direction. Scores range from 0 to 40; higher scores indicate higher perceived stress. <i>Cronbach alpha for the 10 items in the study sample at baseline was 0.62.</i>
<b>Burnout</b>	The 14-item Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure (SMBM) on feelings at work in the past month [60]. The SMBM has undergone psychometric testing in various populations with strong evidence for its validity and reliability in the study setting [31,29,30,60–62]. Questions capture three domains: physical fatigue, emotional exhaustion, and cognitive weariness, with responses ranging from 1 (never or almost never) to 7 (always or almost always). Mean scores are generated which range from 1 to 7; higher scores indicate higher burnout. <i>Cronbach alpha for the 14 items in the study sample at baseline was 0.92.</i>
<b>PCMC</b>	The 9-item provider reported PCMC scale measures care provision in the last month [16]. This scale was developed based on the patient reported PCMC scale and mixed-methods research with providers [3,7,13,14,63]. Questions gauge routine PCMC practices including introductions to patients, calling patients by name, explaining purpose of examinations, procedures, and treatments, asking questions; allowing preferred birth companions and birth positions; and negative behaviors such as verbal and physical abuse. Each question has 4 frequency response options: no, never (0); yes, a few times (1); yes, most of the time (2); yes, all the time (3). Summative scores are created after recoding all response to the same direction; higher scores indicate higher PCMC. Scores range from 0 to 27. <i>Cronbach alpha for the 9 items in the study sample at baseline was 0.75.</i>
<b>Explicit bias</b>	Two situationally specific vignettes assessing providers' perceptions of women's PCMC expectations and behaviors based on SES [15,17]. One vignette describes a woman with low SES and the other vignette a high SES woman; vignettes were read in counter-balanced orders to providers and followed by 8-questions assessing providers' perceptions of the woman's expectations for introductions, consenting, companionship, potential to cooperate, understand explanations, and exaggerate pain; and provider behavior needed to convey seriousness and gain patient cooperation. The vignettes and questions were informed by measurement of explicit bias in prior literature [64,65] and prior research in this setting [14,13,63–65]. Response options range from strongly disagree to strongly agree on a 4-point scale. Summative scores are created after recoding all responses to the same direction; higher scores indicate higher bias towards the woman in the vignette. Scores range from 0 to 27. <i>Cronbach alpha for the 8 items in the study sample at baseline was 0.70 for the low SES vignette and 0.80 for the high SES vignette.</i>
<b>Implicit bias</b>	The SES-PCMC <i>Implicit Association Test (IAT)</i> measures associations between women's SES and providers' perceptions of women as 'difficult' or 'good.' [15], programmed in Inquisit Lab version 5 [66]. The IAT is a cognitive-behavioral test that measures the strength of automatic associations between concepts in people's minds based on a sorting task that has been used to measure implicit bias based on factors such as race, gender, SES, religion [67–69]. The IAT used for this study was first developed with providers in the study setting [15]. Attributes of 'good' patients were likable, cooperative, respectful, intelligent, and responsible; and attributes of 'difficult' patients were irresponsible, uncooperative, rude, annoying, and stupid. High SES descriptors were wealthy, well-educated, well-dressed, and a banker; and low SES descriptors were poor, uneducated, old/torn clothes, and a cleaner. The IAT score represents the difference in the average length of time it takes to sort words during various sections of the test and range from -2 and +2. Increasing positive scores indicate a stronger association of high status and good patient and low status and difficult patient; increasing negative scores indicate a stronger association of high status and difficult patient and low status and good patient.
<b>Physiologic measures of stress</b>	We included <b>heart rate variability (HRV)</b> and <b>hair cortisol</b> as measures of acute and chronic stress respectively [70,71]. HRV is a measure of the beat-to-beat interval between consecutive heart beats to estimate cardiac vagal tone [70,72]. HRV was measured using the CorSense finger monitor by Elite HRV [73], and the natural log of the root mean square of successive differences in RR intervals (LnRMSSD) calculated [70]. The LnRMSSD reflect parasympathetic nervous system activity [70]. Higher LnRMSSD is thus more adaptive and associated with relaxation and calm states, while low levels are associated with anxiety, high stress, and burnout [72,74]. Hair cortisol reflect cumulative secretion of cortisol within the hair growth period, with high levels indicative of chronic or sustained stress [71,75]. We obtained hair samples from providers who had enough hair (at least 2cm long) and willing to provide hair samples. Hair samples were processed at the Stress Physiology Investigative Team lab at the University of Oregon (analytic processes are described elsewhere) [31].

**Table 1: Characteristics of Study facilities**

Facility	Maternity bed capacity	Deliveries per year	Number of providers in maternity unit			
			Doctors	Nurses/ midwives	Clinical officers	Support staff
MCRH	100	4200	3	23	2	4
Kehancha	24	1300	1	7	0	3
Rongo	13	1440	1	9	2	3
Ntimaru	20	1200	0	9	2	1
Awendo	12	600	1	8	2	4
Isbania	12	600	0	7	2	3

**Table 2: Baseline characteristic of the study participants, N=80**

Characteristics	Category	Control (N=40)	Intervention (N=40)	P
		Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	
<b>Gender</b>	Male	14 (35.0)	8 (20.0)	0.133
	Female	26 (65.0)	32 (80.0)	
<b>Age</b>	30 or below years	9 (22.5)	12 (30.0)	0.632
	31-40	20 (50.0)	16 (40.0)	
	41 or above	11 (27.5)	12 (30.0)	
<b>Current marital status</b>	Single	2 (5.0)	11 (27.5)	0.003
	Currently Married	34 (85.0)	29 (72.5)	
	Divorced/Widow/separated	4 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	
<b>Number of children</b>	No children	1 (2.5)	5 (12.5)	0.149
	1 to 3	26 (65.0)	27 (67.5)	
	4 or more	13 (32.5)	8 (20.0)	
<b>Position</b>	Doctor	2 (5.0)	1(2.5)	0.287
	Clinical officer	3(7.5)	0(0.0)	
	Nurse/Midwife	25(62.5)	31(77.5)	
	Support staff	10(25)	8(20.0)	
<b>Years of work as a health provider</b>	0 to 5 years	12 (30.0)	15 (37.5)	0.169
	6 to 10 years	19 (47.5)	11 (27.5)	
	More than 10 years	9 (22.5)	14 (35.0)	
<b>Years in current facility</b>	2 years or below	22 (55.0)	20 (50.0)	0.654
	3 or more years	18 (45.0)	20 (50.0)	
<b>Days of work per week</b>	5 or fewer	31 (77.5)	29 (72.5)	0.606
	More than 5 days	9 (22.5)	11 (27.5)	
<b>Training on how to deal with stress</b>	No	39 (97.5)	39 (97.5)	1.000
	Yes	1 (2.5)	1 (2.5)	
<b>Ever had training on unconscious bias (n=79)</b>	No	38 (97.4)	34 (85.0)	0.108
	Yes	1 (2.6)	6 (15.0)	
<b>Training on interpersonal interactions</b>	No	38 (95.0)	34 (85.0)	0.263
	Yes	2 (5.0)	6 (15.0)	
<b>Highest level of education</b>	Secondary or below	8 (20.0)	10 (25.0)	0.847
	College (middle level)	26 (65.0)	25 (62.5)	
	University or above	6 (15.0)	5 (12.5)	
<b>Perceived social status of family growing up</b>	Bottom half	25 (62.5)	28 (70.0)	0.478
	Upper half	15 (37.5)	12 (30.0)	
<b>Perceived social status of self now</b>	Bottom half	18 (45.0)	11 (27.5)	0.104
	Upper half	22 (55.0)	29 (72.5)	
<b>Social mobility</b>	Upward mobility	27 (67.5)	33 (82.5)	0.163
	No change	7 (17.5)	6 (15.0)	
	Downward mobility	6 (15.0)	1 (2.5)	
<b>From the County</b>	No	10(25.0)	18(45.0)	0.061
	Yes	30(75.0)	22(55.0)	
<b>Religion</b>	Catholics	12 (30.0)	12 (30.0)	0.597
	Methodist/Presby/Anglican	2 (5.0)	3 (7.5)	
	Protestant/Pentecostal	6 (15.0)	10 (25.0)	
	Seventh Day Adventist	20 (50.0)	15 (37.5)	

The full sample consists of 80 providers (40 each in the intervention and control groups). Total less than 80 due to missing data are noted.

**Table 3: Estimates of primary outcomes at baseline and endline for control and intervention groups**

Outcome measure	Statistic	Overall estimates		P*
		Baseline	End line	
		Control group (N=40)		
Stress knowledge	Mean (SD)	7.95 (2.77)	8.53 (2.01)	0.399
	Median (Range)	8.50 (0.00,11.00)	9.00 (3.00,12.00)	
Implicit bias knowledge	Mean (SD)	9.13 (2.14)	9.45 (2.16)	0.604
	Median (Range)	9.00 (4.00,13.00)	9.50 (4.00,13.00)	
Perceived Stress	Mean (SD)	20.58 (4.51)	20.05 (5.57)	0.399
	Median (Range)	20.50 (9.00,30.00)	20.00 (8.00,31.00)	
Burnout	Mean (SD)	3.70 (1.10)	3.42 (1.08)	0.330
	Median (Range)	3.96 (1.14,5.29)	3.57 (1.23,5.21)	
IAT (n=34)	Mean (SD)	0.67 (0.46)	0.43 (0.55)	0.017
	Median (Range)	0.81 (-0.41,1.54)	0.44 (-1.48,1.47)	
Low SES vignette score	Mean (SD)	16.30 (3.27)	14.91 (3.12)	0.081
	Median (Range)	15.90 (10.00,25.00)	15.00 (7.00,20.00)	
High SES vignette score	Mean (SD)	17.85 (3.22)	15.25 (4.66)	0.006
	Median (Range)	17.50 (11.00,24.15)	15.00 (7.00,26.00)	
Self-reported PCMC provision	Mean (SD)	59.83 (18.76)	62.80 (16.48)	0.270
	Median (Range)	58.93 (28.57,96.43)	64.29 (28.57,96.43)	
HRV (n=32)	Mean (SD)	3.71 (0.61)	3.84 (0.63)	0.231
	Median (Range)	3.68 (2.01,4.58)	3.78 (2.03,5.46)	
Cortisol (N=7)	Mean (SD)	8.43 (3.03)	36.05 (58.29)	0.043
	Median (Range)	6.90 (5.55,13.35)	15.00 (5.25,167.18)	
Intervention group (N=40)				
Stress knowledge	Mean (SD)	7.78 (2.41)	9.50 (1.80)	<0.001
	Median (Range)	8.00 (1.00,11.00)	9.50 (5.13)	
Implicit bias knowledge	Mean (SD)	8.93 (1.94)	10.70 (1.73)	<0.001
	Median (Range)	9.00 (5.00,13.00)	10.00 (7.00,14.00)	
Perceived stress	Mean (SD)	20.89 (3.86)	18.63 (5.34)	0.019
	Median (Range)	21.50 (11.00,29.00)	19.00 (3.00,31.00)	
Burnout	Mean (SD)	3.64 (1.05)	2.95 (0.97)	0.001
	Median (Range)	3.93 (1.07,5.21)	3.21 (1.00,4.64)	
IAT (n=34)	Mean (SD)	0.75 (0.37)	0.62 (0.52)	0.209
	Median (Range)	0.79 (-0.18,1.35)	0.63 (-0.50,1.61)	
Low SES vignette score	Mean (SD)	17.38 (3.06)	15.65 (3.76)	0.051
	Median (Range)	17.00 (11.00,25.00)	15.50 (7.00,23.00)	
High SES vignette score	Mean (SD)	18.14 (4.38)	15.60 (4.31)	0.011
	Median (Range)	17.00 (9.00,28.00)	15.00 (7.00,23.00)	
Self-reported PCMC provision	Mean (SD)	57.75 (17.16)	65.51 (13.61)	0.026
	Median (Range)	53.57 (28.57,96.43)	64.29 (35.71,92.86)	
HRV (n=34)	Mean (SD)	3.70 (0.59)	3.71 (0.43)	0.871
	Median (Range)	3.76 (2.33,5.18)	3.72 (2.92,4.62)	
Cortisol (N=15)	Mean (SD)	74.13 (147.38)	41.50 (72.19)	0.460
	Median (Range)	14.25 (6.30,455.70)	13.35 (4.50,278.78)	

\*Wilcoxon paired signed-rank test

IAT: Implicit Association Test; SES: Socioeconomic status; PCMC: Person-centred maternity care; HRV: Heart rate variability.

Missing data on IAT and HRV are due to some providers not able to complete the IAT and loss of internet connectivity during HRV measurement resulting in data not saved, respectively. Missing data on hair cortisol are due to some providers having their hair cut too short or unwilling to provide a hair sample with many providing samples at only one time point resulting in very few paired data points (only 7 paired for control and 15 for intervention)

**Table 4: Multivariate analysis of primary outcomes stratified by study group**

Study period	Control	Intervention		
	Coefficient (95 % CI)	P	Coefficient (95 % CI)	P
<b>Stress knowledge</b>				
Baseline	Reference	-	Reference	
End line	0.66 (-0.23,1.55)	0.144	1.59 (0.75,2.43)	<0.001
<b>Implicit bias knowledge</b>				
Baseline	Reference	-	Reference	
End line	0.28 (-0.63,1.18)	0.543	1.64 (0.82,2.45)	<0.001
<b>Perceived stress</b>				
Baseline	Reference	-	Reference	
End line	-0.76 (-2.99,1.47)	0.498	-2.50 (-4.70, -0.30)	0.026
<b>Burnout</b>				
Baseline	Reference	-	Reference	
End line	-0.48 (-0.95,-0.02)	0.041	-0.82 (-1.24, -0.41)	<0.001
<b>IAT</b>				
Baseline	Reference	-	Reference	
End line	-0.25 (-0.49,-0.01)	0.042	-0.05 (-0.27,0.17)	0.652
<b>Low SES vignette score</b>				
Baseline	Reference	-	Reference	
End line	-1.55 (-3.01,-0.08)	0.039	-2.09 (-3.59,-0.58)	0.007
<b>High SES vignette score</b>				
Baseline	Reference	-	Reference	
End line	-2.79 (-4.78,-0.79)	0.007	-3.14 (-5.15,-1.12)	0.003
<b>PCMC</b>				
Baseline	Reference	-	Reference	
End line	1.71 (-5.40,8.82)	0.633	8.07 (1.29,14.84)	0.020
<b>HRV</b>				
Baseline	Reference	-	Reference	
End line	0.21 (-0.07,0.49)	0.146	0.01 (-0.21,0.23)	0.922
<b>Cortisol</b>				
Baseline	Reference	-	Reference	
End line	25.52 (-6.97,58.01)	0.101	-39.66 (-98.24,18.93)	0.178

Notes:

1. Stress knowledge model controls for sex, social status, length of provider and being a clinician
2. Implicit biased knowledge model controls for education level and length of provider
3. Perceived stress model controls for marital status, role, and work hours
4. Burnout model controls for sex, age, religion, social status, and work hours
5. IAT model controls for marital status, days per week worked, and being a clinician
6. Low SES model controls for hours worked and being a clinician
7. High SES model controls for hours worked and being a clinician
8. PCMC model controls for education level, religion and being a clinician
9. HRV model controls for sex and length of provider
10. Cortisol model controls for length of provider, hours worked and being a clinician

**Table 5: Difference in difference analysis of CPIPE effect on different outcomes**

Outcome measure	Coefficient (95% CI)	Percentage difference	P
Stress knowledge	0.90 (-0.27,2.06)	10.83%	0.130
Implicit bias knowledge	1.31 (0.13,2.49)	36.43%	0.030
Perceived Stress	-1.68 (-4.59, 1.23)	-81.35%	0.256
Burn out	-0.42 (-1.02,0.17)	-34.54%	0.160
Low SES	-0.39 (-2.34,1.57)	-32.02%	0.696
High SES	-0.43 (-2.94,2.07)	-35.25%	0.732
PCMC	6.29 (-3.34,15.92)	33.60%	0.199

Notes: DID presented for only variables with statistically significant differences in multivariate analysis



**Table 6: Intervention Impact themes and representative quotes**

<i>Level</i>	<i>Theme</i>	<i>Representative quotes</i>
<b>Individual</b>	<b>Increased knowledge and competence in stress management</b>	<p>“...during the training, we were taught that when you want to release the stress you sing, dance and this will help you to release stress. I have been doing the exercise whenever I am stressed.” <b>FA-SS-0223</b></p> <p>“Stress just comes suddenly but the techniques like grounding and the breathing in exercise helped me to calm my nerves unlike before when I could just be angry and project it to the client.” <b>FB-CP-0102</b></p> <p>“I now know how to calm down am not the bitter nurse I. was before, I know how to cope with the stresses that we are going through in the maternity. I can handle difficult cases, the way I use to freeze when I got emergencies, I no longer freeze I just breath in and out then I quickly do what is expected of me” <b>FB-CP-0107</b></p>
	<b>Improved management of clinical complications and difficult situations</b>	<p>“Actually, we have discussed four topics, about the PPH, but for PPH am not the one who took her (mentee) through. I am the mentor, but I came to realize that there are some areas that my mentee is so good [that] I learned from her. The areas where I had weakness, she also helped me, and this is because we set the ground at the beginning that we can help each other. As a result of this we mentored each other very well.” <b>FB-CP-0104</b></p> <p>“Like today we had a patient who was critical in our ward and the patient husband was somehow difficult to deal with and we had the language barrier, am not a Luo and the husband is a Luo and speaking English: and Kiswahili was difficult to him. So, he was talking some nasty things in Luo about the nurses who were on duty, so somebody translated them to me, and apparently, I was the one who was handling that patient and it reached a point where I told myself like should I leave what I’m doing because of the husband. But then again. I thought of the mindful tactics, and it really helped me because I just relaxed for a moment and continued to help the patient because had I put all the stress caused by the husband, then the mother would have suffered, and at the end of it all, I managed to help the patient. <b>FA-CP-0205</b></p> <p>“[in a prior case a patient] she refused to be stitched until she became anaemic because of the bleeding, so she got referred and was transfused. ... After I had attended the training, I learnt that when I get such a client, I don’t need to get angry with her the way I was, but I should calm down and look for a language to talk to her...I learnt the technique of being calm, good approach, not being angry and breathing in and out. At least in fact it helped me. <b>FB-CP-0107</b></p>
	<b>Improved provider wellbeing and experience</b>	<p>“Previously we were having a lot of stress and we did not know how to manage such stress, so through CPIPE we have managed stress and I personally I have learnt a lot and it has helped me because I used to have high blood pressure and since the training and monthly refreshers, I was having the [blood] pressure and it stopped. I no longer take medication for pressure.” <b>FB-CP-0204</b></p> <p>“...sharing my stresses with my colleagues now made me to enjoy coming to work and my anger towards the patients was also delt with. Before, I could shout at the mothers so much in the maternity without bothering that the mothers are in pain and that is why maybe they are not cooperating. But nowadays, it’s not easy to find me shouting at them. Even when one [ a patient] is messing around the linen, I just ask the caretaker to talk to the mothers quietly to make them cooperate. Nowadays, I no longer insult the mothers.” <b>FB-CP-0106</b></p> <p>“.. it helped me to understand myself better and I realized how best I can handle situations in both my workplace and my social life. <b>FB-CP-0101</b></p>
	<b>Increased bias awareness and</b>	<p>“...this is because before we attended this training, we had discrimination when we looked at an individual, like, maybe this is a nurse or even a doctor then we want to give them the</p>

	<b>mitigation behaviours</b>	<p><i>best attention compared to the other class of mothers who are dirty without anything. At least we can now give them equal service (with) no discrimination. If everybody can get to the seminar, we can change like me. Ever since I went to the training, I have changed.”</i> <b>FB-CP-0107</b></p> <p><i>“In my a profession especially as a nurse when a patient come we need her to be well equipped because we know that at antenatal clinic they are usually taught how to prepare for delivery and many a time women come for delivery when they have not planned, some come without towels so initially we were evaluating them by using unconscious bias and a mother who come very organized we would attend to them very nicely and those who came unkempt we would not attend to them well but now we have realized our mistakes and we no longer treat them based on their appearance.”</i> <b>FA-CP-0208</b></p> <p><i>“There is a time, I had a girl who was fourteen years old, and she came to deliver and with the assumptions that we had that these young girls are difficult [...] and we were judging them that they are not supposed to be mothers, they should be in school, and that they should cooperate the way they cooperated when they got pregnant. So, I have learnt that we should handle the girls just like any mother because pregnancy comes with pain; I explained to the girl on what I expect her to do during labor, encouraging her and talking to her and getting consent from her.”</i> <b>FB-CP-0114</b></p>
<b>Interpersonal</b>	<b>Supportive work environment</b>	<p><i>“...previously, we the providers never had time to laugh but after the training, and when we were going on with our refresher training, we would vent our stress and share your experience and you feel good about your work. At least nowadays, you will find that after we have gone through the shift report, people nowadays spare ten to fifteen minutes to vent out and share how the shift was [...] well it's kind of a debrief.”</i> <b>FA-CP-0201</b></p> <p><i>“They [peer groups] were awesome because you get to understand what others are going through, so what others are going through is common and so you get to come up with mechanisms on how to cope with them and we shared our issues with the facility management, some were sorted, but some are still in the process. But you find that burnout which was making us to be irritable is no longer there. So, it has helped us understand that there are those things which you can change and those that you cannot change, but life will continue.”</i> <b>FB-CP-0109</b></p> <p><i>“...[before] we as support staff could be seen as very low people socially. Nurses could just call us that you helper can you come here, but now that they have been taught about unconscious biasness, at least we now work with them like colleagues, the issues of unconscious biasness has stopped....Also, the issue of salary which I have already told you that we were paid and the remaining two months we have told today that it has been signed and we will be paid anytime and also relation between us and patients has improved unlike before.”</i> <b>FB-SS-0116</b></p>
	<b>Improved provision of PCMC</b>	<p><i>“Like when a mother on labor comes to the maternity, I greet a patient and introduce myself to them to make them want to free with me. Like there was a day when a mother came to labor and we were on duty with a colleague nurse, he wanted to do for her VE, but the lady refused, so I went and talked to the lady and I explained for her the reason why we examine her is to know how far the baby is, and so she accepted that I do her the VE... She declined [because] the other nurse was a male one and that made her to be more difficult. So just proper communication after I introduced myself to her and explained why we are doing the examination to her and that the male nurse is a colleague who is also working in the maternity to do the same then she accepted.”</i> <b>FB-CP-0106</b></p> <p><i>“...through the training they really refer to CPIPE as being of great help, at least the idea of providers shouting and slapping the women has really changed. These trainings have really made me to know how to deal with different types of patients and their challenges.”</i> <b>FA-CP-0206</b></p>

		<p><i>“Providers had fun and I can say even their attitude changed, in as much as it is so hard to gauge the attitude. But nowadays even the reception of a client is good, I can attest to that because there is an organization that call mothers and to meet quarterly and they give feedback. They even have a voice record of mothers who come to deliver in our facility, they are saying that the services at [facility A] are just wonderful in as much as we are overwhelmed with work, we usually update the mothers of their stages; like there is feedback of information and that is because of the trainings <b>FA-CP-0201</b></i></p>
<b>Institutional</b>	<b>Increased accountability</b>	<p><i>“.. Like we have another nurse here, who like me, was so rough on patients and she has calmed down because everybody has changed. We [nurses] are all on her neck, so she definitely has to stop being rough.” <b>FB-CP-0106</b></i></p> <p><i>“Before when a mother entered the facility, a nurse would shout can you give me your clinic card, when did you start feeling pain? But nowadays they welcome them and even introduce themselves to the patients, they ask the patients name, how we handle patients has changed like pinching the mothers has stopped. When I first came to work here, I didn’t like it as a nurse could shout at a mother from the nursing desk, you mother I want a baby not anything else, until when I see the head is when I will come but nowadays, the nurse would stand next to the mother, talk to the mother on what to do when she is in pain. People who had bad characters here in maternity have changed...” <b>FB-SS-0116</b></i></p> <p><i>“It is good to train all of us because there is always rotation in departments so if we are all trained then whoever is working in OPD when brought to maternity, if trained then will work well without bringing the old nursing where we could insult and beat mothers in maternity without anyone questioning.” <b>FB-CP-0106</b></i></p>
	<b>Collective action and advocacy to address sources of stress.</b>	<p><i>“If it were not for us sitting in this peer support group meetings and putting pressure on our nursing officer as a team who is also putting pressure on the top leadership[...]we saw miracles happen [...]I think you did engage them well, because even if we were discussing issues like lack of toilets, we could just discuss and give the reports to the nursing officer. He could take the information to the county because the toilets have been constructed by the county. So, I feel that our complaints reached them [leadership]. The essential commodities we have complained about them for a long time. Nothing was done about it until when you [CPIPE] came in. After our peer support meetings, I don’t know how you did it, but the county team brought us the commodities which we have not been having for so many years.” <b>FA-CP-0104</b></i></p> <p><i>“Some of the commodities that we did not have in the maternity like sometimes we could be dealing with mothers with preeclampsia and you do not know her pressures, you find her convulsing all over sudden so when we raised a complain on the same during our peer support meetings, we were brought for a BP machine....Before you could find a BP machine without batteries but nowadays the management ensures that the BP machines have working batteries in them all the time and they are functioning...Things like gloves, strappings after we complained nowadays, we have them. <b>FB-CP-0107</b></i></p> <p><i>R: There was a day you came for the training, and we really complained about the problem with the toilets and the bathrooms. After you left at least we saw a change like sanitation at least has improved, now patients are having their meals...unlike before when they had to buy food from outside and also some commodities have been bought, even though they are not enough but it is better... yes like sanitation for maternity has really improved like the bad smell in the maternity is no longer there, the county unblocked the toilets, one toilet was also constructed outside here, the casuals got paid and so now they are working and doing their cleanings well and so we have seen a lot of benefits. <b>FB-CP-0109</b></i></p>
<b>Notes:</b> FA: Facility A; FB: Facility B; CP: clinical provider; SS: Support staff.		